

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
David Boies (*pro hac vice*)
333 Main Street
Armonk, NY 10504
Tel: (914) 749-8200
dboies@bsflp.com

Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)
mmao@bsflp.com
44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 293 6858
Facsimile: (415) 999 9695

SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
Bill Carmody
(*pro hac vice*)
bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (212) 336-8330

MORGAN & MORGAN
John A. Yanchunis (*pro hac vice*)
jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Telephone: (813) 223-5505

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs; additional counsel
listed in signature blocks below*

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

Andrew H. Schapiro (*pro hac vice*)
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
Teuta Fani (admitted *pro hac vice*)
teutafani@quinnemanuel.com

Joseph H. Margolies (admitted *pro hac vice*)
josephmargolies@quinnemanuel.com
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 705-7400
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
Crystal Nix-Hines (CA Bar No. 326971)
crystalnixhines@quinnemaue.com
Rachael L. McCracken (CA Bar No. 252660)
rachaelmccracken@quinnemanuel.com
Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)
alyolson@quinnemanuel.com
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 443-3000
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

*Attorneys for Defendant; additional counsel
listed in signature blocks below*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,
JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER
CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO
individually and on behalf of all other
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,
v.

GOOGLE LLC,
Defendant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**PARTIES' PROPOSED STATEMENTS
OF THE CASE**

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
Courtroom 1 – 4th Floor
Date: November 29, 2023
Time: 9:00 a.m.

Pursuant to Paragraph 3(h) of the Court’s Pretrial Instructions in Civil Cases, Plaintiffs and Defendant Google LLC hereby submit the parties’ proposals and positions for the Joint Proposed Statement of the Case. The Parties have been unable to agree on a joint statement, and therefore provide competing proposals.

PLAINTIFFS’ PROPOSAL¹

This is a civil class action brought by Plaintiffs against Google. Plaintiffs allege that Google unlawfully collected, saved, and used their private browsing data when they used certain private browsing modes to visit non-Google websites while not signed into their Google accounts.

Plaintiffs are pursuing seven claims that you will learn more about during this trial. Those claims are being brought by those Plaintiffs individually and also as a class action. A class action is a lawsuit that has been brought by one or more plaintiffs on behalf of a larger group of people who have similar claims. Because of the large number of class members that are at issue in this case, not everyone in the class needs to testify.

The two classes that I have certified for this trial—which you will hear more about later—seek changes to Google’s practices, which is referred to as injunctive relief. I will decide whether the classes are entitled to any injunctive relief and if so what relief. That is not an issue that you need to decide. Instead, you will be deciding the five Plaintiffs’ individual claims, including their requests for monetary relief. In other words, that is the money these five people are seeking for

¹ **Google’s Objection:** Google objects to Plaintiffs’ statement as misleading and intended to bias the jury by suggesting that Plaintiffs’ claims in this trial, for individual damages, are class claims and suggesting that the jury will impact class wide injunctive relief. This reference is highly prejudicial and misrepresents the role of the jury. The sole class claims are for injunctive relief and the decision on whether injunctive relief should issue is a decision for the Court. Plaintiffs also misleadingly claim the Court has certified two classes without making clear that two classes simply relate to different private browsing modes. The reference to “classes that I have certified” also prejudicially and inaccurately suggests that this Court blessed these classes and may lead jurors to believe that the Court has already concluded Plaintiffs’ claims have merit.

Plaintiffs’ Response: Plaintiffs seek to fairly present the relevant issues to the jury consistent with the Court’s orders. The Court certified two classes for injunctive relief: 1) Incognito users (Class 1); and 2) other private browsing mode users (Class 2). Plaintiffs propose to correctly inform jurors that injunctive relief is a matter for the Court. This is proper and important context for the jury.

1 themselves, not either of the classes. Your role for the class part of this case is an advisory one,
 2 meaning that your decisions on the five Plaintiffs' individual claims may influence my decision
 3 about whether the classes are entitled to injunctive relief against Google.

4 **GOOGLE'S PROPOSAL**²

5 This case is about claims made by five Plaintiffs about Google's receipt of data when users
 6 are in private browsing modes, such as Chrome Incognito.

7 When users visit websites that have chosen to use Google services such as advertising,
 8 maps, and analytics, Google receives the following data to provide the service, regardless of
 9 whether the users are in regular browsing mode or private browsing mode:

- 10 (a) the user's IP address;
- 11 (b) information identifying the user's device model and browser software;
- 12 (c) the URL (web-page address) of the web-page visited;
- 13 (d) geolocation information, if available; and
- 14 (e) information contained in Google cookies.

15 The Plaintiffs claim that Google improperly collected these five types data while they
 16 browsed the web in Chrome's Incognito mode or another browser's private mode. They contend
 17 that by collecting those data types while they were in private browsing mode, Google breached its
 18 contract with its users, violated the Federal Wiretap Act, violated the California Invasion of
 19 Privacy Act, invaded their privacy, intruded on their seclusion, and violated the Computer Data
 20 Access and Fraud Act. Plaintiffs seek money damages. Plaintiffs have the burden to prove their
 21 claims by a preponderance of the evidence.

22 Google denies all these claims. Google also asserts affirmative defenses. Google claims
 23 that neither its Privacy Policy nor any of its other disclosures promised that using a private
 24 browsing mode would block Google's collection of the data. Rather, Google contends that its
 25

26 ² **Plaintiffs' Objection:** The Parties have extensively briefed their legal positions (motions to
 27 dismiss, for class certification, for summary judgment, and for jury instructions). Plaintiffs object
 28 to Google's proposed statement as imbalanced, misleading, prejudicial, and contrary to the Court's
 prior rulings. Plaintiffs will be prepared to address this further at the Pretrial Conference.

disclosures make clear that Chrome's Incognito mode and other private browsing modes are intended to provide *local* privacy—meaning privacy from others who might use the same device, like a spouse, roommate or child—by deleting browsing history and cookie information from the user's system when they close their private browsing session. Google also contends that Incognito mode provides privacy from online entities (including Google) by making the data anonymous (in other words, it is not connected with the individual user or their Google account). Google contends that it disclosed the data collection in its Privacy Policy, and that the Plaintiffs consented to that policy and the collection of data set out in the policy. Google has also asserted additional defenses that will be explained to you in the jury instructions. Google has the burden to prove its defenses by a preponderance of the evidence.

Plaintiffs deny Google's affirmative defenses.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: November 1, 2023

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

By: /s/ Andrew H. Schapiro

Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
Teuta Fani (admitted *pro hac vice*)
teutafani@quinnemanuel.com
Joseph H. Margolies (admitted *pro hac vice*)
josephmargolies@quinnemanuel.com
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 705-7400
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
Sara Jenkins (CA Bar No. 230097)
sarajenkins@quinnemanuel.com
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
Crystal Nix-Hines (Bar No. 326971)

DATED: November 1, 2023

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP

By: /s/ Mark C. Mao

Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)
mmao@bsflp.com
Beko Reblitz-Richardson (CA Bar No. 238027)
brichardson@bsflp.com
44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 293 6858
Facsimile (415) 999 9695

David Boies (*pro hac vice*)
dboies@bsflp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
333 Main Street
Armonk, NY 10504
Tel: (914) 749-8200

James W. Lee (*pro hac vice*)
jlee@bsflp.com
Rossana Baeza
rbaeza@bsflp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
100 SE 2nd Street, Suite 2800
Miami, FL 33130
Telephone: (305) 539-8400
Facsimile: (305) 539-1304

crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com
 Rachael L. McCracken (CA Bar No. 252660)
 rachaelmccracken@quinnemanuel.com
 Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)
 alyolson@quinnemanuel.com
 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90017
 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Jomaire Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com
 D. Seth Fortenbery (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 sethfortenbery@quinnemanuel.com
 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
 New York, NY 10010
 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Xi ("Tracy") Gao (CA Bar No. 326266)
 tracygao@quinnemanuel.com
 Carl Spilly (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com
 1300 I Street NW, Suite 900
 Washington D.C., 20005
 Telephone: (202) 538-8000
 Facsimile: (202) 538-8100

Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
 jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC

Bill Carmody (*pro hac vice*)
 bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
 Shawn J. Rabin (*pro hac vice*)
 srabin@susmangodfrey.com
 Steven Shepard (*pro hac vice*)
 sshepard@susmangodfrey.com
 Alexander P. Frawley (*pro hac vice*)
 afrawley@susmangodfrey.com
 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
 New York, NY 10019
 Telephone: (212) 336-8330

Amanda Bonn (CA Bar No. 270891)
 abonn@susmangodfrey.com
 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
 Los Angeles, CA 90067
 Telephone: (310) 789-3100

Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334
 alanderson@bsflp.com
 M. Logan Wright CA Bar No. 349004
 mwright@bsflp.com
 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
 725 S. Figueroa Street, 31st Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90017
 Telephone: (813) 482-4814

John A. Yanchunis (*pro hac vice*)
 jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
 Ryan J. McGee (*pro hac vice*)
 rmcgee@forthepeople.com
 MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.
 201 N Franklin Street, 7th Floor
 Tampa, FL 33602
 Telephone: (813) 223-5505
 Facsimile: (813) 222-4736

Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805
 MORGAN & MORGAN
 711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 Tel: (415) 358-6913
 mram@forthepeople.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

ATTESTATION

I, Andrew H. Schapiro, hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 5-1, that the concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

DATED: November 1, 2023

By: /s/ Andrew H. Schapiro